DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 630 CS 506 654

AUTHOR Gaines, Blair R.
TITLE Americans for Germany in World War I.
PUB DATE Apr 89
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association (Louisville, KY, April 6-8, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Audience Response; *Mass Media Role; *Persuasive Discourse; Press Opinion; *Public Opinion; *Public Relations; Rhetorical Criticism
IDENTIFIERS Americans (United States); British; *Fatherland (The); German Americans; Germans; Germany; Rhetorical Strategies; *World War I

ABSTRACT

The pro-German American newspaper "The Fatherland," published shortly before the United States entered the First World War (1914-1917), displayed a failure of public relations in terms of defining and offering themes likely to convince a target audience to side with Germany. By looking at a public relations campaign undertaken by the paper, a study examined the goals of "The Fatherland's" founders, the newspaper's likely audiences, the problems encountered, and the major themes that the paper's writers employed in attempting their strategy. The newspaper eventually gained a circulation of 75,000. Findings showed that (1) the editor sought to sway Americans to the German side, building on Americans' respect for German character, against the sympathies of the nation and its media for the British and against the tide of events of war; and (2) the argumentative style of the articles was a further hindrance to convincing Americans, among other ideas, that the Germans were better friends to them than the British, which resulted in the newspaper's audience narrowing to German-Americans and pro-Germans. (Forty-five notes are included.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED306630

AMERICANS FOR GERMANY IN WORLD WAR I

A public relations study

Blair R. Gaines

Assistant Professor of Communication

Auburn University at Montgomery

Montgomery, AL 36193-0401

April 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Blair Gaines

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS506654

ABSTRACT

The American newspaper The Fatherland, published during the years of the First World War, offers a case study in the failure of public relations in terms of defining and offering themes likely to convince a target audience. The editor sought to sway Americans to the German side, building on Americans' respect for German character, against the sympathies of the nation and its media for the British and against the tide of events of war. The argumentative style of the articles was a further hindrance to convincing Americans, among other ideas, that the Germans were better friends to them than the British, and the paper's audience narrowed to German-Americans and pro-Germans.

AMERICANS FOR GERMANY IN WORLD WAR I: A Public Relations Study

Much has been written about how media messages were shaped for Americans during World War I, specifically about the strength and organization of the British propaganda machinery, about the willingness of the American press to take the easy and optimistic stories offered by and controlled through British censorship, and about the difficulty for the German side of getting messages to the United States since the international cable had been cut.

It is valuable to look at such a case today--even though modern methods of communication make on-the-scene information immediately accessible to large audiences--because public relations strategies of improving image are still based on the verities of finding a target audience and phrasing messages for that audience that will build a positive image of your cause.

This study examines a public relations campaign from the losing side, specifically from the German side in World War I. This study examines public relations undertaken for Germany in the United States by a group of Americans in the years before American entry into the war with the purpose of <u>possibly</u> swaying American opinion to the German side on some issues and certainly of maintaining American neutrality. The medium created for this public relations campaign was a weekly newspaper that eventually gained a circulation of about 75,000.[1]

This paper summarizes the goals that the paper's founders had for it in moving American public opinion, the paper's likely audiences, and the problems it encountered and will review some of the major themes that the paper's writers employed in attempting their strategy.

The Fatherland

At the outbreak of hostilities there was apparently no realization on the part of the German government of the important role that the United States would play in the war. The Germans were notorious for their inept approaches to American public opinion and underestimation of the moral resources at the disposal of the United States.[2] Consequently, although a "propaganda cabinet" of Germans quickly arrived in New York,[3] no serious thought was given to the necessity of having a well-rounded organization knowledgeable about the United States to take care of German interests in this country.[4] Some of the slack was taken up by native Americans; the best-known of these was first-generation American George Sylvester Viereck, a flamboyant character who began his publishing career as a poet and ended it with, among other writings, an account of his days in prison for his pro-German activities in World War II. Viereck called his weekly The Fatherland.

Viereck was a naturalized American citizen, the son of a German politician. After graduation from the College of the City of New York and successes with several books of poetry, he helped found The International, a literary magazine that proclaimed itself to be for the newest tastes in literature. Many of its

contributors would later write for The Fatherland and many of its German advertisers would follow. Viereck's membership in the Poetry Society of America and the Author's League was terminated in 1914, however, because of the poem "Wilhelm II, Prince of Peace," published in The Fatherland; the final line, "For if thou fail, a world shall fall"[5] was the reason.[6]

The German-Americans and Germans , on the defensive, needed a skilled spokesman. Viereck said in his memoirs that his "financial and emotional interests lay with them, and his special talent answered their greatest need."[7] But while clearly tied to German nationals and German interests, Viereck created a newspaper that was aggressively American, defining itself in terms of American ideals and politics for an American audience. Late in the life of the publication in wartime he changed its name to The American Weekly to prove that his priorities lay with American interests.

Throughout, the tone of articles in The Fatherland was that of one concerned American speaking to others of the legitimacy of German actions and claims and the common bonds between the United States and Germany. Often argumentative in style, however, the paper seems to have been viewed by its creator as a kind of fact sheet with which pro-German Americans could buttress their arguments in discussions with friends. This view is evident in one ad featuring two gentlemen debating war issues; the man on the attack is arguing convincingly from The Fatherland, and he holds a copy in his hand like a passive weapon.[8] The newspaper

was the ideal public relations vehicle, in truth a controlled medium for one point of view available nationwide as a newspaper.

The first issue of The Fatherland was put on the newsstands Aug. 10, 1914, just ten days after Germany's declaration of war on Russia and weeks before official German propaganda efforts were begun in the United States. Viereck said of himself: "When the German propagandists arrived in New York, they found George Sylvester Viereck at the head of a pro-German weekly, The Fatherland, flaunting from all newsstands the colors of the Central powers." The newspaper was published as a weekly until Sept., 1918, even after American entrance into the war, when Viereck had to define the role of his enterprise in public relations on behalf of Germany as: "We are for America, but not for the Allies." During that time, for instance, he crusaded for alternatives to war service for German-American conscripts.

The appearance of the paper was unusual and has to be taken into account as part of the overall public relations strategy. Next to the grey-columned newspapers and literary or opinion magazines of the day, The Fatherland looked more like a tabloid-sized feature magazine. It often sported vivid colors on its covers and appears to modern eyes to resemble the formats and personality interest later found in newsmagazines. It is clear that its editor hoped to catch the eye of the reader at the newsstand. The publication certainly did not have the look of the dull, tightly-typed newsletters that go out even today to memberships of the convinced.

Audience. The audience for this newspaper can be defined, first, as German-Americans, immigrants recently in the United States or with a strong interest in and allegiance to Germany; second, pro-German Americans, not of German nationality but perhaps, like the Irish, allied with the German point of view on some issues or simply respectful of German-Americans or Germany; and, finally, all Americans, including those who might be actively anti-German. Logically Viereck and his little paper could not hope to reach all Americans and do the convincing pictured in the advertisement among millions of undecided or antagonistic citizens. So its focus settled more realistically on reinforcing the bonds of German-Americans to their native land and arguing against those who fought Germany. Americans at this time had a strong respect for the industry, abstemiousness, and incorruptability in politics of German-American citizens, as a popular stereotype.

There were in The Fatherland, then, articles whose themes could be read on several levels, from information that would ostensibly help persuade a neutral American to favor Germany to information that would be "unabashedly pro-German" for those who appreciated that persuasion. The optimistic Viereck wanted a vehicle for German ideas in the English language to reach all Americans, not merely those who read German-language publications, but he probably understood how limited his paper's most dedicated audience was, as shown in this story he told about the paper's founding:

> George Sylvester Viereck, poet and journalist, and three of his friends, a young banker, a young chemist, and a young accountant, met and agreed that something ought to be done to ensure fair play for Germany and to safeguard the interests of American citizens of German descent, who suffered keenly from the assaults on their kinsmen.
>
> "Why not," Viereck suggested, "publish a magazine that will print the truth?"
>
> "It must be a weekly," someone said, "because events move quickly."
>
> "What will it cost to bring out the first issue?"
>
> "We can probably print 10,000 copies for $200," remarked Viereck.
>
> Each of the participants pledged fifty dollars to pay for the expense of the first number. But no further contributions were needed. The Fatherland immediately caught on.

The first edition was sold out almost immediately and was reprinted several times. Circulation, consisting of newsstand sales and subscriptions sold by agents and by mail, surged to more than 65,000 by mid-October, barely two months after the paper's introduction. Circulation levelled off at about 75,000,[9] although Viereck claimed a circulation high of 100,000.[10]

A National Forum. Probably as important to Viereck as a national distribution of his newspaper and its views was the location of his enterprise in New York, the media capital of the United States. Because of his identity assumed so early in the conflict as a spokesman for German interests in the United States, Viereck was occasionally sought out for interviews, but also churned out reprints, helped place in American media stories based on speeches or writings of pro-Germans, and issued many pro-German pamphlets (e.g., "Germany's Hour of Destiny.")[11] He

had two public relations forums, then: one, the newspaper, its circle of subscribers, and its wider circle of pass-along readership who might receive a copy and read it; two, his editorial and civic position as articulate representative and informed thinker about the issues of the day from the German perspective. He was a frequent public speaker on behalf of German interests, gave public interviews, and found that his editorials were reprinted widely in at least German-American newspapers.

Since American sentiment (and media orientation) at the outbreak of war was clearly pro-Ally, Viereck saw himself as a mouthpiece or leading representative of German-Americans, assimilated Americans who according to Census figures made up nearly 10 percent of the American population at that time. He said later:

> I have certain knowledge of the psychology of the American public and certain connections which may make my advice of some value. I am of the opinion that The Fatherland and I have been able to place more facts before the American public from the German point of view than the entire German Information Service.[12]

Ties to the Germans. In fairness, Viereck's shadowy connections to those propagandists and to a well-studied network of German intrigues and spies ought to be mentioned, since he did take a stipend of $750 a month from the Germans for his paper[13] and did open its columns for their material--articles, ads for pamphlets, publicity for speeches and rallies, etc. This group's overt purpose was to create personal contacts between Germany's official spokesmen and American newspapers--the baseline of good

public relations--but they failed, according to German Ambassador Johann von Bernstorff, because of the inadequacy and poor timing of their materials, the obviousness of their appeals, and failure to couch the issues vividly in terms of American interests.[14] Viereck, having proved himself better at that in the pages of The Fatherland, was "assigned to the aggressive group in the propaganda cabinet, furnishing editorial matter and giving public interviews on a variety of subjects."[15]

One of the now-laughable mistakes the Germans made was the revelation in the New York World of the contents of the briefcase of Dr. Heinrich Albert, one of the German propagandists, which Albert carelessly left on the subway. The contents showed evidence that Germans were paying American and European correspondents and made it seem that Germans were buying munitions factories and planning spy rings, among other damaging revelations (Albert claimed the papers included unread crackpot mail coming to his group.)[16] The publication of these papers destroyed for the Germans the element of straightforwardness.

Goals. Viereck most certainly would have characterized himself as a journalist or a public relations strategist rather than a propagandist--at least at the time. Recall that he had the advantage of being first in the field, ahead of official German publicity machinery at the very opening days of the war, and that he sought to influence Americans through an American medium about American interests in the issues of the day. Defining his work as public relations requires that the planning

set definite goals for reaching key publics, which he and his co-editors did at the initial meeting at which The Fatherland was founded:

> First: to place the German side of this unhappy quarrel fairly and squarely before the American people. Hitherto the American Press has offered its readers quite an amazing volume of anti-Teutonic prejudice in place of historical information.
>
> Second: to review, week by week, the actual events of the war so far as they can be authoritatively ascertained. Only the real unquestionable facts as admitted by the governments will be given, and the readers will not be confused by unsubstantiated rumors or fakes.
>
> Third: to review, week by week, the attitude of the American press, to combat, as far as lies in our power, the misstatements of...the German-hater and to protect against injustice towards a race that has rightfully earned the sympathy and admiration instead of the jealousy of the so-called civilized world for its industry, its art, its philosophy, and its humanity."[17]

Themes of Articles in The Fatherland, 1914-1917

Thus Viereck had to shape themes and messages in his newspaper to accomplish these goals and to appeal to a general American audience as well as his dedicated core audience of pro-Germans or German-Americans. And because his stated goal was to treat the events of the day, the themes and messages relate for the most part to putting the best face on the declining fortunes of Germany in world public opinion. Negative themes proved useful, too, for the most part portraying Britain as America's traditional enemy. The major themes, those about which articles appeared regularly and in great number, can be listed as: maintaining American neutrality, fear of Britain, ties between Germany and the United States, and corrections of war news in the Allied press.

Neutrality. Probably the single most important theme for The Fatherland's writers in actual count of articles devoted to the subject and in the prevalence of this idea throughout most of the writing was the need to keep America neutral and out of the war. This theme could of course be played along a continuum from accenting the dangers of war to America to bolstering existing isolationist sentiment then getting national attention in the U.S. Congress. The pages of The Fatherland indicate a progression of ideas about American neutrality that changed in parallel to the course of the war. During the first months of war the paper urged adherence to the legalities of strictly defined neutrality, specifically promoting equal American trade with all belligerents. To support this theme the newspaper ran articles such as "Let the Flag Protect the Cargo"[18] and "Give Germany a Square Deal," by Robert M. La Follette.[19] When the balance of trade clearly favored the Allies, the paper's articles shifted their persuasion to demand an end to trade with all belligerents. One article pointed out that torturously effective, extra-large dum-dum bullets were being manufactured in the United States, so it was easy to appeal for an end to this trade on humanitarian grounds. Thirdly, Americans and their mass media condemned Germany for the sinking of the Lusitania, and when Germany resumed unrestricted submarine warfare, the writers had to fall back on warning the United States of entanglement with Britain, as in "Shall Americans Submit to Great Britain's Commercial Yoke?"[20] In the final months before the United States entered the war, The Fatherland sounded the then-popular idea

that the United States, by staying out of the war, could act as world peacemaker, unstained by the conflict. This theme clearly appealed to both isolationist sentiment and the notion that America was somehow special, above the fray. A final piece on this theme was aptly titled "America First and America Only."[21]

Britain as Villain. To argue to its audience that Britain was to be feared, The Fatherland took three main tacks: to expose examples of alleged British barbarism in the war and in colonial administration, to condemn British interference with the neutrals' trade, and to call up the spectre that after the war Britain would have the United States in its pocket. The Fatherland's writers exposed mistreatment of German-Americans in Britain or its possessions, as in "Help the Germans in Canada--Aliens in Their Own Land"[22] or "American Citizens Arrested in Great Britain."[23] Articles about trade had such sensational headlines as "England--The International Thief,"[24] and articles about interference with Americans' mail appeared frequently. Finally, according to the newspaper, the world after this war would be no safer for Americans with Britain in domination. Editors bannered such stories with headlines such as "Are We No Longer A Sovereign Nation?"[25] and "American Liberties Menaced."[26] A wintertime cover, certainly appearing naive today, pictured George Washington in prayer at Valley Forge over the headline, "He Fought the Same Enemy Then That Germany Fights Today."[27]

Ties with Germany. Articles on this theme emphasized the popularly accepted idea of the German-American as upstanding, contributing citizen, the enlightenment of German civilization to

the world, and common political and commercial interests between the two countries and attempted to dispel the image of German militarism. "The German-Americans and the Flag"[28] demonstrates an approach to the first theme, and former President Theodore Roosevelt was credited as author on two articles on the second theme, for example "Germany, Teacher of the World."[29] To build the image of common political and commercial interests, The Fatherland selected target audiences to whom to appeal in such articles as "How the American Manufacturer is Affected by the War"[30] or "What Prolongation of the War Means to the American Farmer."[31] To argue against Germany as militaristic, one author wrote in "Prussia's Blighting Influence" that that influence "means civilization, culture, progress, and prosperity."[32] Most articles were less emotional, piling up charts and statistics to prove that the Allies were putting more men and materiel into the war than Germany was or by defining the threat posed to Germany by "1,290,000 Russians, 720,000 Frenchmen, against whom she keeps an armed force not even half the number her opponents have under arms."[33]

Setting the News Straight. Viereck set out to reveal mistakes and errors of the pro-Ally press, but found after the early months of the war that editorial optimism in calling for fairness would not influence a broad range of sympathies. After the sinking of the Lusitania these articles grew more embittered in tone, as if Viereck knew his columns were reaching only those needing no encouragement to "fair play for Germany and Austria-Hungary." Among the early articles several have a lighter touch

appropriate for reaching that broader audience, as in "What Most Papers Suffer From is Rumortism."[34] The appeal to all Americans shows in "New York Dailies Tired of Being Victims of the London Censor."[35] By the latter period, however, the titles are more acrid: "New York Herald Again Breaks the Law"[36] and "What the Censor Suppressed--And What the New York Newspapers Aided Him in Suppressing."[37] The contrast between the earlier and later articles about the New York papers emphasizes this change in the theme.

Minor Themes. A review of the articles in this weekly shows other themes about subjects seemingly selected to make Americans angry or fearful. A spate of early articles attempted to uncover the "fraud" of Belgian neutrality, and the paper even found a Belgian priest to interview who defended Germany.[38] The future threat that Japan would pose to the United States was covered in such articles as "Japan's Broken Pledges"[39] and "Closing the Open Door of China,"[40] along with others strong in racist overtones. The paper also attempted to influence and forecast American politics, to the point that when Wilson was re-elected in 1916--and the paper had earlier forecast "Wilson Has Lost 92 Percent of the German-American Vote"--it was said to be German-Americans who had turned the tide in his favor in response to the slogan "He Kept Us Out of War."[41]

Summary and Conclusion

The titles of these examples show that The Fatherland's contributors had to write from the defensive, but they also indicate the unfortunate argumentative or hectoring tone typical of the paper's editorial content. In the May 2, 1917, issue, Viereck presented a map purporting to show readership distribution around the United States, and the writing underneath it is forbidding:

> The map should be of interest to every reader of Viereck's Weekly....The conclusions...the readers get in the form of carefully weighed articles written by men who have read the daily news for a full week and gleaned therefrom the important facts, separating the chaff from the grain....Big men must get a clear view of events.... Our readers should, from to-day on, make it their business to cooperate with this paper for their and its best benefit.[42]

Ambassador Bernstorff called The Fatherland a "courageous little weekly," and it has to be credited with courage in developing an attractive and ahead-of-its-time format in which the pro-German writers attempted, first, to reach and sway a broad American audience and then to reassure and arm with information the native population of German-Americans. The national forum afforded the paper's editor by virtue of his own visibility and that of the paper in America's media capital dwindled, however, in proportion to growing American anti-German sentiment after the sinking of the Lusitania in 1915 and the resumption of unrestricted submarine warfare. Certainly the public relations campaign undertaken by Viereck in The Fatherland was "the primary English-language outlet" for militant pro-Germanism[43] and it did state as its goal being "equally pro-

American and pro-German." Viereck's approach was aggressive, his content was controversial, and his public relations themes in this vivid controlled medium tailored to concerns of Americans. What went awry?

History, of course, went awry, but some blame attaches to Viereck and his newspaper for pursuing an argumentative style in topics and writing and for naively offering ideas that did not square with reporting emphases in the nation's mass media. Laswell has faulted German propaganda effort in general for failing to appeal to Americans' emotions, and The Fatherland's pages offer argument and statistics in great quantity. The paper did present one genuine issue for debate, that of American neutrality. It "presented a reasonable case with conviction. But on the other great issue of the first war years--the sinking of the Lusitania--the instincts of its editor were out of step not only with the sympathies of most Americans but also of the segment of German-Americans"[44] that was the paper's core audience. One example that shows how The Fatherland could also create controversy is the story that Viereck had foreknowledge of the Lusitania's sinking. This story circulated after he wrote in The Fatherland that "before long, a large passenger ship like the Lusitania, carrying...implements of murder to Great Britain," would be sunk as had another British ship recently. Viereck said he merely looked ahead at lists of sailings and picked the Lusitania as a dramatic example. But because the issue with the warning sat on the stands as the Lusitania's sinking was

reported,[45] Viereck was accused of having definite information about the Germans' plans.

While claiming to put American interests before all others and looking at issues on behalf of all Americans, Viereck was slow in evaluating shifts in American sentiment and again naive in sticking to themes of happy German-American unity ("Celebrate George Washington's birthday: Buy a Subscription to The Fatherland"). While Viereck's involvement with the German nationals working on propaganda and espionage was not revealed at the time, popular fear of German intrigues did the paper little good. The public relations campaign was a failure, too, because themes such as correcting errors in the press are nitpicking to American readers. The paper's very focus was thus off to the side of powerful currents in American public opinion, and the colorful George Sylvester Viereck folded what had become The American Monthly and Germanic Review in 1929.

NOTES

[1]H.C. Peterson, Propaganda for War (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939), p. 134.

[2]Ray H. Abrams, Preachers Present Arms (New York: Round Table Press, 1933), p. 19.

[3]New York Times, July 28, 1918, 10:1.

[4]E. von Ludendorff, Meine Kriegserringerungen, Vol. I. (Berlin: E.X. Mittler and Sohn, 1919), pp. 284-313.

[5]The Fatherland, Aug. 10, 1914, p. 3.

[6]"Viereck," The New Yorker, June 15, 1940, p. 15.

[7]George Sylvester Viereck, Spreading Germs of Hate, New York: H. Livright, 1930, p. 48. Quoted narratives that follow about the establishment of the newspaper are from this source.

[8]The Fatherland, Nov. 8, 1914, p. 12.

[9]Peterson, p. 139.

[10]Viereck, p. 75. Issues of the newspaper quoted the circulation figure as 100,000 after just a few weeks. For comparison, the circulation of the New York Staats-Zeitung was nearly 83,000 in 1915.

[11]Kent Cooper, The Right to Know (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, 1956), p. 93.

[12]Viereck, p. 50.

[13]Felice A. Bonadio, "The Failure of German Propaganda in the United States, 1914-1917," Mid-America, XLI (January, 1959), p. 40-57.

[14]Johann Heinrich von Bernstorff, My Three Years in America, (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1920), p. 35.

[15]Viereck, p. 70.

[16]Franz von Papen, Memoirs (New York: Dutton, 1953).

[17]The Fatherland, Aug. 10, 1914, p. 2

[18]"Let the Flag Protect the Cargo," Dec. 23, 1914.

[19]Robert M. LaFollette, "Give Germany a Square Deal," Nov. 11, 1914, p. 9

[20]"Shall Americans Submit to Great Britain's Commercial Yoke?" March 10, 1915, p. 3.

[21]"America First and America Only," April 11, 1917; Viereck added that "We are under no obligation to include the Allied in our prayers."

[22]Arthur von Briesen, "Help the Germans in Canada--Aliens in Their Own Land," Dec. 2, 1914, p. 9.

[23]Frederick Franklin Schrader, "American Citizens Arrested in Great Britain," Dec. 9, 1914, pp. 9-10.

[24]Charles A. Collman, "England--The International Thief," Oct. 18, 1916, pp. 163-5.

[25]"Frederick S. Schrader, "Are We No Longer a Sovereign Nation?" May 26, 1915, p. 4.

[26]"American Liberties Menaced," Feb. 28, 1917, p. 55.

[27]Dec. 10, 1914.

[28]C.J. Hexamer, "The German Americans and the Flag," June 21, 1916, p. 311.

[29]Theodore Roosevelt, "Germany, Teacher of the World," Dec. 15, 1915, p. 331. It seems unlikely that Theodore Roosevelt would have written expressly for The Fatherland, but it is not mentioned that this was a reprint or summary of other material.

[30]Hugo Schweitzer, "How the American Manufacturer is Affected by the War," Dec. 16, 1914, pp. 11-12.

[31]Hugo Schweitzer, "What Prolongation of the War Means to the American Farmer," Dec. 9, 1914, pp. 3-4.

[32]Frederick Franklin Schrader, "Prussia's Blighting Influence," Sept. 14, 1914, p. 9.

[33]"The 'Militarism' of Germany," Nov. 4, 1914, pp. 3-4.

[34]"What Most Papers Suffer From is Rumortism," Aug. 17, 1914, p. 13.

[35]"New York Dailies Tired of Being Victims of the London Censor," Nov. 4, 1914, p. 5, reprinted from the New York Post of Oct. 28.

[36]"New York Herald Again Breaks the Law," Oct. 25, 1916, p. 187.

[37]George Sylvester Viereck, "What the Censor Suppressed--And What the New York Newspapers Aided Him in Suppressing," April 12, 1916, p. 148.

[38]"Belgium's Breach of Neutrality," Dec. 2, 1914, pp. 1-17.

[39]"Japan's Broken Pledges," Oct. 21, 1914, p. 13.

[40]"Closing the Open Door of China," May 5, 1915, p. 11.

[41]"Wilson Has Lost 92 Per Cent of the German-American Vote," June 23, 1915, pp. 6-7; Frederick Franklin Schrader, "The Presidential Elections Reviewed," Nov. 15, 1916, pp. 234-4.

[42]"The Sun Never Sets on Subscribers to The Fatherland," May 2, 1917, p. 219.

[43]von Bernstorff, p. 35.

[44]Phyllis Keller, States of Belonging: German-American Intellectuals and the First World War (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979), p. 140.

[45]May 12, 1914, p. 10.